

TEXAS ASSOCIATION
OF DEFENSE COUNSEL, INC.,
Austin, TX, June 19, 2001.

*Re nomination of Justice Patricia Owen for the
United States Fifth Circuit of Appeals.*

Senator PATRICK LEAHY,
Senate Judiciary Committee,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SENATOR LEAHY: I have had the privilege of knowing Justice Patricia Owen of the Texas Supreme Court, both personally and professionally, for many years. I cannot imagine a more qualified, ethical, and knowledgeable person to sit on the United States Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

I accept the reality that politics is a part of our culture, but I know that when it comes to appointing federal judges, we must transcend politics and look to character and ability. Patricia Owen has the character and ability to make all of us, Democrat and Republican, proud.

I ask that your Committee act swiftly to confirm her nomination to the United States Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

E. THOMAS BISHOP.

HUGHES/LUCE, LLP.,
Dallas, TX, July 15, 2002.

Hon. PATRICK LEAHY,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, Russell
Senate Office Building, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN LEAHY: As past presidents of the State Bar of Texas, we join in this letter to strongly recommend an affirmative vote by the Judiciary Committee and confirmation by the full Senate for Justice Priscilla Owen, nominee to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

Although we profess different party affiliations and span the spectrum of views of legal and policy issues, we stand united in affirming that Justice Owen is a truly unique and outstanding candidate for appointment to the Fifth Circuit. Based on her superb integrity, competence and judicial temperament, Justice Owen earned her *Well Qualified* rating unanimously from the American Bar Association Standing Committee on the Federal Judiciary—the highest rating possible. A fair and bipartisan review of Justice Owen's qualifications by the Judiciary Committee certainly would reach the same conclusion.

Justice Owen's stellar academic achievements include graduating cum laude from both Baylor University and Baylor Law School, thereafter earning the highest score in the Texas Bar Exam in November 1977. Her career accomplishments are also remarkable. Prior to her election to the Supreme Court of Texas in 1994, for 17 years she practiced law specializing in commercial litigation in both the federal and state courts. Since January 1995, Justice Owen has delivered exemplary service on the Texas Supreme Court, as reflected by her receiving endorsements from every major newspaper in Texas during her successful re-election bid in 2000.

The status of our profession in Texas has been significantly enhanced by Justice Owen's advocacy of pro bono service and leadership for the membership of the State Bar of Texas. Justice Owen has served on committees regarding legal services to the poor and diligently worked with others to obtain legislation that provides substantial resources for those delivering legal services to the poor.

Justice Owen also has been a long-time advocate for an updated and reformed system of judicial selection in Texas. Seeking to remove any perception of a threat to judicial impartiality, Justice Owen has encouraged the reform debate and suggested positive

changes that would enhance and improve our state judicial branch of government.

While the Fifth Circuit has one of the highest per judge caseloads of any circuit in the country, there are presently two vacancies on the Fifth Circuit bench. Both vacancies have been declared "judicial emergencies" by the Administrative Office of the U.S. Courts. Justice Owen's service on the Fifth Circuit is critically important to the administration of justice.

Given her extraordinary legal skills and record of service in Texas, Justice Owen deserves prompt and favorable consideration by the Judiciary Committee. We thank you and look forward to Justice Owen's swift approval.

DARRELL E. JORDAN.

On behalf of former Presidents of the State Bar of Texas: Blake Tartt; James B. Sales; Hon. Tom B. Ramey, Jr.; Lonny D. Morrison; Charles R. Dunn; Richard Pena; Charles L. Smith; Jim D. Bowmer; Travis D. Shelton; M. Colleen McHugh; Lynne Liberato; Gibson Gayle, Jr.; David J. Beck; and Cullen Smith.

[From the Washington Post, July 24, 2002]

THE OWEN NOMINATION

The nomination of Priscilla Owen to the 5th Circuit Court of Appeals creates understandable anxiety among many liberal activists and senators. The Texas Supreme Court justice, who had a hearing yesterday before the Senate Judiciary Committee, is part of the right flank of the conservative court on which she serves. Her opinions have a certain ideological consistency that might cause some senators to vote against her on those grounds. But our own sense is that the case against her is not strong enough to warrant her rejection by the Senate. Justice Owen's nomination may be a close call, but she should be confirmed.

Justice Owen is indisputably well qualified, having served on a state supreme court for seven years and, prior to her election, having had a well-regarded law practice. So rather than attacking her qualifications, opponents have sought to portray her as a conservative judicial activist—that is, to accuse her of substituting her own views for those of policymakers and legislators. In support of this charge, they cite cases in which other Texas justices, including then-Justice Alberto Gonzales—now President Bush's White House Counsel—appear to suggest as much. But the cases they cite, by and large, posed legitimately difficult questions. While some of Justice Owen's opinions—particularly on matters related to abortion—seem rather aggressive, none seems to us beyond the range of reasonable judicial disagreement. And Mr. Gonzales, whatever disagreements they might have had, supports her nomination enthusiastically. Liberals will no doubt disagree with some opinions she would write on the 5th Circuit, but this is not the standard by which a president's lower-court nominees should be judged.

Nor is it reasonable to reject her because of campaign contributions she accepted, including those from people associated with Enron Corp. Texas has a particularly ugly system of judicial elections that taints all who participate in it. State rules permit judges to sit on cases in which parties or lawyers have also been donors—as Justice Owen did with Enron. Judicial elections are a bad idea, and letting judges hear cases from people who have given them money is wrong. But Justice Owen didn't write the rules and has supported a more reasonable system.

Justice Owen was one of President Bush's initial crop of 11 appeals court nominees, sent to the Senate in May of last year. Of these, only three have been confirmed so far,

and six have not even had the courtesy of a hearing. The fact that President Clinton's nominees were subjected to similar mistreatment does not excuse it. In Justice Owen's case, the long wait has produced no great surprise. She is still a conservative. And that is still not a good reason to vote her down.

[From the New York Times, January 25, 2002]

CORRECTIONS

An article in *Business Day* on Tuesday about criticism of Justice Priscilla Owen of the Texas Supreme Court, a nominee for a federal judgeship who accepted campaign donations from Enron, misstated the amount of money saved by the company because of a decision she wrote, dealing with taxes owed to a local school district. It was \$224,988.65, not \$15 million. The larger sum, cited in her opinion as the district's revenue loss, was the amount by which the value of a piece of the company's land was lowered.

NOMINATION OF CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER, OF PENNSYLVANIA, TO BE UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

Mr. REID. Mr. President, under the previous order, the Senate will now proceed to the consideration of Executive Calendar No. 826.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Christopher C. Conner, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Pennsylvania.

Mr. REID. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Pennsylvania be recognized for up to 3 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered. The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized for 3 minutes.

Mr. SANTORUM. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Nevada for agreeing to recognize me.

Now that the nomination has been confirmed by the Senate, I congratulate Kit Conner from outside of Harrisburg, PA, for filling the vacancy in the Middle District. Judge Conner is one of six members from Pennsylvania who are on the Executive Calendar in the Senate. Including him, there are five district judges and one Third Circuit nominee, and I am very gratified we have been able to unlock the logjam on judges and begin the process of moving forward.

Kit Conner is a very distinguished member of the bar in the Middle District in Pennsylvania. He is a tremendous lawyer and advocate, someone who has made substantial contributions to his community and is going to be an excellent Middle District judge. I look forward to his swearing in ceremony very soon.

If we go down the listing of judges in the order in which they appear on the calendar, the next judges to be confirmed are also Pennsylvania judges, at least nominees for judicial vacancies, and they would be Joy Flowers Conti from the Western District of Pennsylvania, John Jones from the Middle District, and then D. Brooks Smith, who is

a judge from the Western District who has been nominated for the Third Circuit. Hopefully next week, maybe as early as Monday or Tuesday, we can get to these nominations in the order in which they appear on the calendar. That seems to be the way the Senate is proceeding, and so we can begin to fill some of these vacancies we have in Pennsylvania, and in particular the Judge Brooks Smith vacancy to the Third Circuit, so we can begin to get the expeditious justice that people in Pennsylvania and the Third Circuit deserve.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the nomination of Christopher C. Conner, of Pennsylvania, to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Pennsylvania?

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is laid upon the table, and the President will be notified of the Senate's action.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, with today's confirmation of Mr. Christopher Conner to the District Court for the Middle District of Pennsylvania, the Democratic-led Senate will have confirmed a total of 60 judicial nominees since the change in Senate majority a little over one year ago and 49 district court nominees.

Today's nominee has not proven to be very controversial and the Senate has acted quickly on this nomination.

Mr. Conner was nominated in March of this year to a relatively recent vacancy and received a hearing in May, shortly after his paperwork was completed.

With today's confirmation, the Judiciary Committee will have held hearings for a total of 10 District Court nominees from Pennsylvania, including Judge Davis, Judge Baylson and Judge Rufe, who were confirmed in April. Those confirmations illustrate the progress being made under Democratic leadership and the fair and expeditious way this President's nominees are being treated.

With today's confirmation, we will have confirmed four nominees to the District Courts in Pennsylvania. I think that the Senate Judiciary Committee and the Senate as a whole have done well by Pennsylvania, despite some of the obstructionist practices during Republican control of the Senate, particularly regarding nominees in the Western half of the State.

Nominees from Philadelphia were not immune from Republican obstructionist tactics, despite the best efforts and diligence of my good friend from Pennsylvania, Senator SPECTER, to secure confirmation of all of the judicial nominees from all parts of his home State, without regard to which party controlled the White House.

For example, Judge Legrome Davis was first nominated to the position of U.S. District Court Judge for the Eastern District of Pennsylvania by Presi-

dent Clinton on July 30, 1998. The Republican-controlled Senate took no action on his nomination and it was returned to the President at the end of 1998. On January 26, 1999, President Clinton renominated Judge Davis for the same vacancy. The Senate again failed to hold a hearing for Judge Davis and his nomination was returned after two more years.

Under Republican leadership, Judge Davis' nomination languished before the Committee for 868 days without a hearing.

Unfortunately, Judge Davis was subjected to the kind of inappropriate partisan rancor that befell so many other nominees to the district courts in Pennsylvania and to the Third Circuit during the Republican control of the Senate. I want to note emphatically, however, that I know personally that the senior Senator from Pennsylvania, strongly supported Judge Davis's nomination and worked hard to get him a hearing and a vote.

The lack of Senate action on Judge Davis's initial nominations are in no way attributable to a lack of support from the senior Senator from Pennsylvania. Far from it.

In fact, I give Senator SPECTER full credit for getting President Bush to renominate Judge Davis earlier this year and commended him publicly for all he has done to support this nomination from the outset.

This year we moved expeditiously to consider Judge Davis, and he was confirmed within a few months of his renomination by President Bush. The saga of Judge Davis recalls for us so many nominees from the period of January 1995 through July 10, 2001, who never received a hearing or a vote and who were the subject of secret anonymous holds by Republicans for reasons that were never explained.

At Judge Davis' recent confirmation hearing Senator SANTORUM testified that Judge Davis did not get a hearing because local Democrats objected. I was the ranking Democrat on the Judiciary Committee during those years and never heard that before. My understanding at the time, from July 1998 until the end of 2000, was that Judge Legrome Davis would have had the support of Senator SPECTER as well as every Democrat on the Judiciary Committee and in the Senate. Despite that bipartisan support, he was not included by the then-Chairman of the Committee in the May 2000 hearing for a few other Pennsylvania nominees.

In contrast, the hearing we had earlier this year for Ms. Conti was the very first hearing on a nominee to the Western District of Pennsylvania since 1994, in almost a decade, despite qualified nominees of President Clinton. No nominee to the Western District of Pennsylvania received a hearing during the entire period that Republicans controlled the Senate in the Clinton Administration. One of the nominees to the Western District, Lynette Norton, waited for almost 1,000 days, and she

was never given the courtesy of a hearing or a vote. Unfortunately, Ms. Norton died earlier this year, having never fulfilled her dream of serving on the Federal bench.

Large numbers of vacancies continue to exist, in large measure because the recent Republican majority was not willing to hold hearings or vote on more than 50 of President Clinton's judicial nominees, many of whom waited for years and never received a vote on their nomination. It is the Democrats, not the Republicans, who have broken with that history of inaction from the Republican era of control, delay and obstruction.

With today's confirmations of Mr. Conner to the Federal district courts in Pennsylvania, the Senate will have confirmed 49 district court nominees, meaning that more than 8 percent of the district court nominees confirmed so far are from Pennsylvania.

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, I rise to support the nomination of Christopher Conner to be U.S. District Judge for the Middle District of Pennsylvania.

I have enjoyed looking over the record of Mr. Conner's broad litigation background, and I have concluded that he will bring to the bench the necessary legal experience and temperament for an effective Federal judge.

Christopher Conner is a native of Harrisburg, PA, and a highly respected civil litigator. Upon graduation from Dickinson School of Law in 1982, Mr. Conner joined the Harrisburg firm today known as Mette, Evans and Woodside. He was named a shareholder in 1988.

He currently serves as chair of his firm's Corporate & Commercial Litigation Practice Group. His practice has focused on civil litigation, primarily business litigation, employment law, mediation, and Federal civil rights litigation. He has handled contract disputes, employment discrimination suits, Lanham Act claims, large-scale class-action cases, sexual harassment cases, and insurance coverage matters.

Mr. Conner is certified as a mediator in Federal and State courts, and he has experience in providing human resources training for businesses and associations, including diversity training.

The ABA has awarded him a unanimous Well Qualified rating, and I rate him highly as well. I strongly believe Mr. Conner will make an excellent Federal judge in Pennsylvania.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Nevada.

NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT, 2003

Mr. REID. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I ask that the Chair lay before the Senate a message from the House with respect to H.R. 4546.

There being no objection, the Presiding Officer (Mr. CARPER) laid before the Senate the following message from the House of Representatives: